



**Attendance:**

Members: Victoria Owen (Chair), Pat Riva (Secretary), Beth Kilmarx, Rehab Ouf, Ana Stevanovic, Deanna White.

Expert Advisors: Chris Oliver, Maja Žumer.

Liaisons: Renate Behrens (RSC), Branka Badovinac (PUC)-until 10:30, Joseph Hafner (LIDATEC), Gordana Mazić (PUC)-from 10:10, Mikael Wetterstrom (ISBD), Jenny Wright (BCM), Megan Price (IFLA Professional Support Officer).

**Apologies:** Sharon Dyas-Correia, Mélanie Roche, Peng Xiao, Ulrike Junger (CDNL).

1. Welcome
2. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved as circulated.

3. Minutes of the meeting of 27 September 2023

The minutes were approved as circulated.

4. Report of the chair – Victoria

Victoria thanked everyone for their participation in committee activities. Ongoing topics are all addressed in the agenda.

5. Membership for 2023-2025
  - a. CoS vacancy and replacement member

CoS has a vacancy as incoming member Elida Ofelia Kraemer tendered her resignation 23 October 2023 via a message on Basecamp. Megan initiated the replacement procedure. The resignation was forwarded to Lidia Putziger, Nominations Coordinator, who is sending the list of other nominees to the GB who will select the replacement.

- b. Coopting and recruiting additional members for RGs

The call for co-opted members went out in the IFLA Newsletter on November 27. The process for making a recommendation from among the nominees received and endorsing it will be followed. The intention is to finalize the new members in January.

6. RG project funds, confirmation of process for 2023 and for 2024

Victoria did not receive any requests for 2023 funds. No pending funding requests were signified in the meeting. Branka expects that UNIMARC will make a request for 2024, but not for 2023.

Beth suggested that RGs may need more clarity on what funds can be used for. Megan clarified that project funds can be used only for RG project meetings. Guidelines for funding for section projects exist, but do not pertain to CoS or RGs. Megan also clarified that IFLA's financial year is the same as

the calendar year. Requests for reimbursement must be received by December 31 although the refund may only be issued in January.

**ACTION:** Megan will get more information on funding and process for RG funds for 2024 and further.

## 7. Finalizing the Standards Manual

### a. Process workflow diagram

Chris posted a scheme for a simple workflow diagram from the point of view of the standards submitter on Basecamp for comment. This diagram is intended for the Standards Manual. Deanna suggests it include an indication of the loop back if the standard isn't approved on the first submission. The more detailed process workflow diagram created by Peng is helpful for CoS members.

**ACTION:** Megan will turn the information into a diagram using Canva.

### b. Submission process for RG standards (replacing role of Division Chair)

Chris summarized the latest changes in the Manual.

- Adapting the process for standards emanating from RGs or other Advisory Committees. Since RGs and Advisory Committees don't attach to Division Chairs, section 5.1 was modified to state that the CoS chair acts as Division Chair in the approval of the submission and thus does not participate in the reviews of these documents.
- Throughout checked for consistency in usage of the term Review Team.
- Section 3: added text to clarify that both approval of the proposal to develop/update a standard and approval of the standard itself are required.
- Clarified the role of the Regional Council chair. When a Regional Division is working on a standard, the Regional Council chair signs the submission only for the proposal stage and not for the submission of the standard for approval.
- Changed 1 month to 6 weeks for the review timeline of a standards submission.
- Weighting of the recommendations from the Review Team members if there is no consensus in the Team: proposed that the CoS review count for 60% of the final score, with 40% between the two other constituents of the Review Team. Discussion that it should be explicitly stated that the other two Review Team responses are weighted 20% each in section 5.1.

There was considerable discussion on this last point. Megan requested formalizing the weighting so that the process at IFLA HQ once the reviews are submitted to her from the three parts of the Review Team can be transparent. In cases where the Division Chair and the PC Chair quickly submit positive recommendations, but CoS submits a more reasoned negative recommendation, she is in a quandary if there is no process, and all responses are considered equal. The CoS recommendation should have the most weight, enough to form a veto, as the CoS review team is usually at least three members and reviewing standards is the main purpose of CoS, thus our members are evaluating more carefully based on the criteria and with experience of having seen multiple standards. The decision mechanism would also allow IFLA HQ to proceed even in cases where either the Division Chair or the PC Chair do not submit their recommendations, as long as CoS has made a recommendation.

Rehab and Renate both commented that in their experience there have been cases where Divisions did send standards forward for approval that CoS did not consider ready, and also that sometimes there were long delays waiting for responses. However, Rehab wondered whether the Manual

needed this much detail and indeed whether the Division Chair and PC Chair should be evaluating the content of the standard and making a recommendation at all. In any case, the time limits for steps in the evaluation need to be respected. Failure to respond within the time limit can be treated as a positive recommendation. Chris reminded that having a formal Review Team with three elements is a change from past practice. In the past, the Division Chair's role was limited to forwarding the document prepared by the professional unit. This change was part of implementing the changes in IFLA governance and the roles of the Division Chairs. Victoria concluded that in this way we are treating the CoS recommendation as final, that the formal weighting implements this in a transparent manner.

**ACTION:** Chris will finalize the text. Megan will do the final formatting and publish in the IFLA repository. Pat will update the CoS webpages referring to the Manual.

8. Request for Participation in Working Group to plan a revision of the UBC Statement (2012)

Pat explained that as an outcome of the satellite meeting *Universal Bibliographic Control at the crossroads: the challenges of unifying IFLA bibliographic standards*, held 18-19 August at KBR in Brussels, which was sponsored by the Bibliography, Cataloguing and Subject Analysis & Access Sections, a multi-section working group is forming to plan for the revision of the IFLA Professional Statement on Universal Bibliographic Control, published in 2012. The existing statement was completed prior to the existence of CoS and among the issues being discussed is where such a statement fits among IFLA standards. The working group would appreciate a member from CoS. Pat attended the first meetings this fall, having been the keynote speaker at the satellite. CoS agreed to participate in the working group and delegated Pat as its representative.

**ACTION:** Pat will communicate this to the UBC WG co-chairs, Mathilde Koskas and Maud Henry.

9. Action on recommendations of the Integration of IFLA Bibliographic Metadata Standards Working Group

a. Role of CoS in coordinating content updates of conceptual models

This item is carried forward to next meeting for lack of time.

10. Route for IFLA support/endorsement of [Cataloguing Code of Ethics](#)

Jenny reported that the UK Metadata and Discovery Group participated in the development of the Code and asks whether it would be relevant to get approval or endorsement from IFLA. If so, is this something that CoS would do? The developing group would like to be able to state: "Endorsed by IFLA".

Victoria is unsure where this fits and considers we would need to look at our mandate. Megan can check whether this needs to go to GB and what the process would be, and what role CoS would have. Deanna considers that an externally developed standard would still need same process as one originating internally to IFLA.

Pat felt that usually CoS would want to see support from the professional unit most appropriate to the topic, in this case the Cataloguing Section. Jenny, as a member of the Cataloguing Section, knows that the Section Standing Committee has not discussed the Code. She can bring it to their chair. Beth agreed that she would also like to see it come forward from a professional unit.

## 11. CoS Reviews

### a. LRMoo from BCM RG

Pat gave an update on the process leading to the version submitted for review by the BCM RG. Victoria asked for at least 3 volunteers to review who did not participate in the development. During the meeting 3 people volunteered, by private message to Victoria.

### b. UNIMARC Bibliographic and UNIMARC Authorities from UNIMARC RG

Branka submitted the forms for each of the formats. These are new editions of the formats integrating many years of updates into the main manuals. Each is about 700 pages with a common structure including examples. The same reviewers should review both formats. Again, Victoria asked for at least 3 volunteers who did not participate in the development. During the meeting 3 people volunteered, by private message.

As these are both lengthy documents and with holidays coming up, the deadline for reviews was set at the end of January 2024.

### c. *IFLA Guidelines for Library Services to Displaced Persons*, resubmission

This resubmission after the first CoS review and feedback was posted on Basecamp today. Members who participated in the first review confirmed their willingness to re-review: Rehab, Deanna, and Beth. Peng had also participated; Beth will email him to confirm. All necessary documents are on Basecamp.

## 12. Communications

### a. Committee on Standards Newsletter update

Ana reported that the newsletter team has received 6-7 news articles and an interview. The issue is not as long as the first but will be long enough to be published early 2024. The newsletter editors are meeting again to finalise. They already have some content – an interview – ready for future issues.

### b. Standards corner in IFLA Newsletter

Megan reported that Chris' article on the Accessibility Metadata Network appeared in the October 2023 issue. The call for RG co-opted members appeared in November. Megan will happily receive articles related to each month's theme.

### c. Web editors update

No report, no substantial changes to the website since the last meeting.

## 13. Accessibility Metadata Network update

Chris reported that the application for the network is being prepared for submission to the next GB meeting. Five sponsoring units have agreed. There are 60 interested people, it is breaking up into subgroups.

## 14. Review Groups reports

### a. BCM

Jenny stated that the main update, that LRMoo is submitted for review, has already been covered.

b. ISBD

Mikael reported that the RG is meeting tomorrow. The ISBDM draft is in internal review at the RG. Shortly the external expert review phase will begin, planned for February-April 2024. This will be followed by a world-wide review in May-July. Mikael noted that ISBDM does not appear on the CoS “standards in progress” page.

**ACTION:** Pat will correct the oversight and add ISBDM as a standard in progress.

c. LIDATEC

Joseph reported that LIDATEC is planning to meet with ISBD about supporting the ISBDM process.

d. UNIMARC

Gordana reported that the subgroup on harmonization with ISBDM is meeting. This is the RG’s main current project.

15. Mid-year/mid-term working meeting in 2024?

Victoria has heard that some units are discussing the possibility of a mid-year meeting, possibly as a 3-day regional meeting in Europe. Time frame might be April or May, no specific dates given yet.

Rehab would like to see a format that is compelling, but not a regional clone of the IFLA WLIC conference. She is following for event planning for the Bibliography section.

Megan expects that the GB should have guidelines for mid-year unit meetings by December 22. Some plans are in the works for platforms to support hybrid or online only events.

**ACTION:** Continue this conversation early in the new year.

16. Other business

Victoria proposed that in future the meetings be planned for a 2-hour timeslot to avoid running out of time for RG reports or substantive discussion.

UNIMARC will be bringing a document on processes and will be working on this with other RGs.

**ACTION:** Megan will prepare an updated list of standards in progress for the next meeting.

17. Next meeting

A doodle will be sent with dates in February or March 2024 for an online business meeting.

18. Close

<b>Membership 2023-2025</b>	
Victoria Owen (chair)	2. Term
Pat Riva (secretary)	2. Term
Sharon Dyas-Correia	2. Term
Beth Kilmarx	2. Term
Rehab Ouf	1. Term
Mélanie Roche	1. Term
Ana Stevanovic	2. Term
Deanna White	2. Term
Peng Xiao	2. Term
<b>Ex-Officio Member 2023-2025</b>	
Sharon Memis	IFLA Secretary General or Designate
<b>Liaisons and Support Officer 2023-2025</b>	
Megan Price	Professional Support Officer at IFLA HQ
Branka Badovinac	UNIMARC liaison
Joseph Hafner	LIDATEC liaison
Mikael Wetterstrom	ISBD liaison
Jenny Wright	BCM liaison
Ulrike Junger	CDNL Representative
Renate Behrens	Liaison from RSC
<b>Expert Advisors 2023-2025</b>	
Chris Oliver	2. Term
Maja Žumer	2. Term